

Polygamy of Entanglement in Multipartite Quantum Systems

Jeong San Kim*

Institute for Quantum Information Science, University of Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4, Canada

(Dated: April 20, 2009)

We show that bipartite entanglement distribution (or entanglement of assistance) in multipartite quantum systems is by nature polygamous. We first provide an analytic upper bound for the concurrence of assistance in bipartite quantum systems, and derive a polygamy inequality of multipartite entanglement in arbitrary dimensional quantum systems.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud

Whereas quantum entanglement in bipartite quantum system has been intensively studied with various applications, entanglement in multipartite quantum systems still seems far from rich understanding. One of the most distinct phenomena of quantum entanglement in multi-party systems is that it cannot be freely shared among parties. For example, if two parties share a maximally entangled state, they cannot have entanglement, nor even classical correlations with any other party. This is known as the *Monogamy of Entanglement* (MoE): The entanglement between one party and all others in multipartite quantum systems bounds the sum of entanglement between one and each of the others. MoE was shown to have a mathematical characterization in forms of inequalities in multi-qubit systems [1, 2] using *concurrence* [3] to quantify the shared entanglement among subsystems.

However, monogamy inequality using concurrence is known to fail in its generalization for higher-dimensional quantum systems. In other words, the existence of quantum states violating concurrence-based monogamy inequality was shown in higher-dimensional systems [4, 5]. Later, it was shown that those counterexamples of concurrence-based monogamy inequality still show monogamous property of entanglement by using a different entanglement measure [5], and this exposes the importance of having a proper way of quantifying entanglement.

Whereas, monogamy inequality is about the restricted sharability of multipartite entanglement, entanglement distribution, which can be considered as a dual concept to the sharable entanglement, is known to have a polygamous property (sometimes referred as *dual monogamy*) in multipartite quantum systems. A mathematical characterization for the *Polygamy of Entanglement* (PoE) was first provided for multi-qubit systems [6, 7] using *Concurrence of Assistance* (CoA) [8]. Recently, polygamy inequality was also shown in tripartite quantum system of arbitrary dimension using *Entanglement of Assistance* (EoA) for the quantification of entanglement distribution [9]. However, a general polygamy inequality of entanglement in multipartite higher-dimensional quantum system is still an open question.

Here, we provide a strong clue for this question. We provide an analytical upper bound of CoA for arbitrary bipartite mixed states, and derive a polygamy inequality of multipartite entanglement in arbitrary dimensional quantum systems. The upper bound is saturated for any two-qubit states, and thus the derived polygamy inequality coincides with the one proposed in [7] for multi-qubit systems.

For any bipartite pure state $|\phi\rangle_{AB}$, its concurrence, $\mathcal{C}(|\phi\rangle_{AB})$ is defined as [3]

$$\mathcal{C}(|\phi\rangle_{AB}) = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{tr}\rho_A^2)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\rho_A = \text{tr}_B(|\phi\rangle_{AB}\langle\phi|)$. For any mixed state ρ_{AB} , its concurrence is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}(\rho_{AB}) = \min \sum_k p_k \mathcal{C}(|\phi_k\rangle_{AB}), \quad (2)$$

and its CoA is

$$\mathcal{C}^a(\rho_{AB}) = \max \sum_k p_k \mathcal{C}(|\phi_k\rangle_{AB}), \quad (3)$$

where the minimum and maximum are taken over all possible pure state decompositions, $\rho_{AB} = \sum_k p_k |\phi_k\rangle_{AB}\langle\phi_k|$.

For a three-qubit state $|\psi\rangle_{ABC}$, a polygamy inequality of entanglement was first introduced as [6]

$$\mathcal{C}_{A(BC)}^2 \leq (\mathcal{C}_{AB}^a)^2 + (\mathcal{C}_{AC}^a)^2, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{A(BC)} = \mathcal{C}(|\psi\rangle_{A(BC)})$ is the concurrence of a 3-qubit state $|\psi\rangle_{A(BC)}$ for a bipartite cut of subsystems between A and BC and $\mathcal{C}_{AB}^a = \mathcal{C}^a(\rho_{AB})$ with $\rho_{AB} = \text{tr}_C(|\psi\rangle_{ABC}\langle\psi|)$. Later, a generalization of Eq. (4) into n -qubit systems [7]

$$\mathcal{C}_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)}^2 \leq (\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_2}^a)^2 + \dots + (\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_n}^a)^2, \quad (5)$$

was also introduced for an arbitrary n -qubit pure state $|\psi\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_n} \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$.

Now, let us consider a bipartite pure state of arbitrary dimension $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_1} \sum_{k=1}^{d_2} a_{ik} |ik\rangle_{AB}$ in $\mathcal{H}^A \otimes \mathcal{H}^B \simeq$

*Electronic address: jkim@qis.ucalgary.ca

$\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$. In terms of the coefficients of $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$, its concurrence can also be expressed as [10]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^2(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) &= 2(1 - \text{tr} \rho_A^2) \\ &= 4 \sum_{i < j} \sum_{k < l} |a_{ik}a_{jl} - a_{il}a_{jk}|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\rho_A = \text{tr}_B(|\psi\rangle_{AB}\langle\psi|)$.

Let m and n be ordered pairs such that

$$m = (i, j), \quad n = (k, l), \quad i < j, \quad k < l, \quad (7)$$

with $i, j = 1, \dots, d_1$, $k, l = 1, \dots, d_2$. As m has $D_1 = d_1(d_1 - 1)/2$ choices of taking i and j from d_1 elements, and similarly $D_2 = d_2(d_2 - 1)/2$ choices for n , with some appropriate orderings of (i, j) and (k, l) , we can label m and n as

$$m = 1, \dots, D_1, \quad n = 1, \dots, D_2. \quad (8)$$

We also let

$$\begin{aligned} L_A^m &= P_A^m (-|i\rangle_A \langle j| + |j\rangle_A \langle i|) P_A^m, \\ L_B^n &= P_B^n (-|k\rangle_B \langle l| + |l\rangle_B \langle k|) P_B^n, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $P_A^m = |i\rangle_A \langle i| + |j\rangle_A \langle j|$ and $P_B^n = |k\rangle_B \langle k| + |l\rangle_B \langle l|$ are the projections onto the subspaces spanned by $\{|i\rangle_A, |j\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|k\rangle_B, |l\rangle_B\}$ respectively. By straightforward calculation, we have

$$|\langle\psi|(L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)|\psi^*\rangle|^2 = 4|a_{ik}a_{jl} - a_{il}a_{jk}|^2, \quad (10)$$

and together with Eq. (6), we have

$$\mathcal{C}^2(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = \sum_{m=1}^{D_1} \sum_{n=1}^{D_2} |\langle\psi|(L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)|\psi^*\rangle|^2. \quad (11)$$

Eq. (10) can be considered as the squared concurrence of the pure state (possibly unnormalized)

$$\begin{aligned} (P_A^m \otimes P_B^n) |\psi\rangle_{AB} &= a_{ik}|ik\rangle_{AB} + a_{il}|il\rangle_{AB} \\ &\quad + a_{jk}|jk\rangle_{AB} + a_{jl}|jl\rangle_{AB} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

in two-dimensional subspaces of $\mathcal{H}^A$ and $\mathcal{H}^B$ spanned by $\{|i\rangle_A, |j\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|k\rangle_B, |l\rangle_B\}$ respectively. Furthermore, Eq. (11) implies that the concurrence of a bipartite pure state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ can be decomposed into the concurrences of two-qubit subspaces in Eq. (10).

For a mixed state $\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle_{AB} \langle\psi_i| = \sum_i |\xi_i\rangle_{AB} \langle\xi_i|$ with $|\xi_i\rangle_{AB} = \sqrt{p_i} |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}$, its average concurrence is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i p_i \mathcal{C}(|\psi_i\rangle) &= \sum_i p_i \left(\sum_{m,n} |\langle\psi_i|(L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)|\psi_i^*\rangle|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \sum_i \left(\sum_{m,n} |\langle\xi_i|(L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)|\xi_i^*\rangle|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \sum_i \sum_{m,n} |\langle\xi_i|(L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)|\xi_i^*\rangle|, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and thus its CoA is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^a(\rho_{AB}) &= \max_i \sum_i p_i \mathcal{C}(|\psi_i\rangle) \\ &\leq \max_i \sum_i \sum_{m,n} |\langle\xi_i|(L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)|\xi_i^*\rangle| \\ &= \sum_{m,n} \left(\max_i \sum_i |\langle\xi_i|(L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)|\xi_i^*\rangle| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the maxima are taken over all possible pure state decompositions of ρ_{AB} . Here, we note that the term after the maximum in the last line of Eq. (14) is the average concurrence of the state (possibly unnormalized)

$$(\rho_{AB})_{mn} = (P_A^m \otimes P_B^n) \rho_{AB} (P_A^m \otimes P_B^n) \quad (15)$$

in the two-qubit subspace spanned by $\{|i\rangle_A, |j\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|k\rangle_B, |l\rangle_B\}$. Thus, the maximum value

$$\max_i \sum_i |\langle\xi_i|(L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)|\xi_i^*\rangle| \quad (16)$$

can be considered as the CoA of the two-qubit state $(\rho_{AB})_{mn}$; therefore, by the optimization methods for CoA in two-qubit systems [8], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^a((\rho_{AB})_{mn}) &= \max_i \sum_i |\langle\xi_i|(L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)|\xi_i^*\rangle| \\ &= \mathcal{F}[\rho_{AB}, (\tilde{\rho}_{AB})_{mn}], \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $(\tilde{\rho}_{AB})_{mn} = (L_A^m \otimes L_B^n) \rho_{AB}^* (L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)$, and $\mathcal{F}[\rho_{AB}, (\tilde{\rho}_{AB})_{mn}]$ is the fidelity of ρ_{AB} and $(\tilde{\rho}_{AB})_{mn}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{F}[\rho_{AB}, (\tilde{\rho}_{AB})_{mn}] = \text{tr} \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_{AB}} (\tilde{\rho}_{AB})_{mn} \sqrt{\rho_{AB}}}. \quad (18)$$

Now, we are ready to have the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *For any bipartite state $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2})$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^a(\rho_{AB}) &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{D_1} \sum_{n=1}^{D_2} \mathcal{F}[\rho_{AB}, (\tilde{\rho}_{AB})_{mn}] \\ &:= \tau^a(\rho_{AB}), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $D_1 = d_1(d_1 - 1)/2$, $D_2 = d_2(d_2 - 1)/2$, and $(\tilde{\rho}_{AB})_{mn} = (L_A^m \otimes L_B^n) \rho_{AB}^* (L_A^m \otimes L_B^n)$.

For any bipartite mixed state ρ_{AB} of arbitrary dimension, the sum of concurrences of all possible two-qubit subspaces is known to provide a lower bound of the concurrence $\mathcal{C}(\rho_{AB})$ [11]. By using the lower bound of the concurrence, it was also shown that there is a proper monogamy inequality of entanglement in multipartite quantum systems [11].

Theorem 1 implies that the sum of CoA of $(\rho_{AB})_{mn}$ from all possible two-qubit subspaces of ρ_{AB} forms an

upper bound of $\mathcal{C}^a(\rho_{AB})$. It can be also directly checked that this bound is saturated for any pure state and two-qubit mixed state.

Now, we provide a polygamy inequality of multipartite entanglement of arbitrary dimension in terms of the upper bound proposed in Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *For any multipartite pure state $|\psi\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_n}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_n}$,*

$$\left(\tau_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)}^a\right)^2 \leq (\tau_{A_1 A_2}^a)^2 + \dots + (\tau_{A_1 A_n}^a)^2. \quad (20)$$

where $\tau_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)}^a = \tau^a\left(|\psi\rangle_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)}\right)$ with respect to the bipartite cut $A_1 - A_2 \dots A_n$, $\tau_{A_1 A_k}^a = \tau^a(\rho_{A_1 A_k})$ and $\rho_{A_1 A_k}$ is the reduced density matrix of $|\psi\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_n}$ onto subsystem $A_1 A_k$ for $k = 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. For $k = 1, \dots, n$, let $m_k = (i_k, j_k)$ be an ordered

pair of $i_k, j_k \in \{1, \dots, d_k\}$ such that $i_k < j_k$, and let $M = (m_2, \dots, m_n)$ be an $(n-1)$ -tuple of the ordered pairs. By letting $D_k = d_k(d_k - 1)/2$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\tau_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)}^a\right)^2 &= \mathcal{C}_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)}^2 \\ &= \sum_{m_1=1}^{D_1} \sum_{M=1}^{D_2 \dots D_n} \left[(\mathcal{C}_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)})_{m_1 M}\right]^2 \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $(\mathcal{C}_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)})_{m_1 M}$ is the concurrence of the (unnormalized) state $(|\psi\rangle_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)})_{m_1 M}$ in the subspace spanned by $\{|i_1\rangle_{A_1}, |j_1\rangle_{A_1}\}, \dots, \{|i_n\rangle_{A_n}, |j_n\rangle_{A_n}\}$.

As $(|\psi\rangle_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)})_{m_1 M}$ is an n -qubit (unnormalized) state for each m_1 and M , it satisfies the multi-qubit polygamy inequality in Eq. (5), that is,

$$\left[(\mathcal{C}_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)})_{m_1 M}\right]^2 \leq \left[(\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_2}^a)_{m_1 m_2}\right]^2 + \dots + \left[(\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_n}^a)_{m_1 m_n}\right]^2, \quad (22)$$

where $(\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_k}^a)_{m_1 m_k}$ is CoA of $(\rho_{A_1 A_k})_{m_1 m_k}$, the reduced operator of $(|\psi\rangle_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)})_{m_1 M}$ onto subsystems $A_1 A_k$

for $k = 2, \dots, n$. From Eqs. (21) and (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\tau_{A_1(A_2 \dots A_n)}^a\right)^2 &\leq \sum_{m_1=1}^{D_1} \sum_{m_2=1}^{D_2} \left[(\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_2}^a)_{m_1 m_2}\right]^2 + \dots + \sum_{m_1=1}^{D_1} \sum_{m_n=1}^{D_n} \left[(\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_n}^a)_{m_1 m_n}\right]^2 \\ &\leq \left[\sum_{m_1=1}^{D_1} \sum_{m_2=1}^{D_2} (\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_2}^a)_{m_1 m_2}\right]^2 + \dots + \left[\sum_{m_1=1}^{D_1} \sum_{m_n=1}^{D_n} (\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_n}^a)_{m_1 m_n}\right]^2 \\ &= (\tau_{A_1 A_2}^a)^2 + \dots + (\tau_{A_1 A_n}^a)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where the last equation is due to Eq. (17) and the definition of τ^a . $\square$

As the upper bound of CoA in Theorem 1 is saturated for any two-qubit mixed state, Eq. (20) in Theorem 2 is reduced to Eq. (5) for the case of multi-qubit systems. Moreover, it can be easily seen that Eq. (20) is saturated by n -qubit generalized W-class states [12], that is,

$$|W\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_n} = a_1 |1 \dots 0\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_n} + \dots + a_n |0 \dots 1\rangle_{A_1 \dots A_n}, \quad (24)$$

with $\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^2 = 1$.

To summarize, we have shown the polygamous nature of distributed entanglement in multipartite quantum

systems of arbitrary dimension. By providing an analytic upper bound of CoA for arbitrary bipartite quantum states, we have derived a polygamy inequality of entanglement in terms of the upper bound. This upper bound is saturated for any two-qubit state, and thus the polygamy inequality proposed here can be considered as a generalization of the result in [7] into higher-dimensional quantum systems.

One of the main difficulties in the study of multipartite entanglement is that there can be several inequivalent classes that are not convertible to each other under *Stochastic Local operations and classical communications* (SLOCC) [13]. These inequivalent classes makes us hardly have an universal way of quantifying multipartite

entanglement, even in an abstract sense.

However, the existence of inequivalent classes of multipartite entanglement also reveals the different characters among different classes. For example, three-qubit systems are known to have two inequivalent classes of genuine tripartite entanglement: one is the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) class [14], and the other one is the W-class [13]. Although the inequivalentness of the classes is due to SLOCC convertibility [13], these two classes also show extreme differences in terms of monogamy or polygamy inequalities of entanglement. In other words, monogamy and polygamy inequalities are saturated by W-class states, whereas the differences between terms in the inequalities can assume their largest values for the GHZ-class state. Thus, MoE and PoE are not only just distinct phenomena in multipartite quantum systems,

they also provide us an efficient way of qualifying multipartite entanglement.

Our result is, we believe, the first case where the polygamy nature of multipartite entanglement in arbitrary-dimensional quantum systems is discussed with mathematical characterizations. Noting the importance of the study on high-dimensional multipartite entanglement, our result can provide a rich reference for future work on the study of multipartite entanglement.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by iCORE, MITACS and US-ARO.

-
- [1] V. Coffman, J. Kundu and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).
 - [2] T. Osborne and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 220503 (2006).
 - [3] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
 - [4] Y. C. Ou, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 034305 (2007).
 - [5] J. S. Kim, A. Das and B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 012329 (2009).
 - [6] G. Gour, D. Meyer and B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 042329 (2005).
 - [7] G. Gour, S. Bandyopadhyay and B. C. Sanders, J. Math. Phys. **48**, 012108 (2007).
 - [8] T. Laustsen, F. Verstraete and S. J. van Enk, Quantum Inf. Comput. **3**, 64 (2003).
 - [9] F. Buscemi, G. Gour and J. S. Kim, arXiv:0903.4413 (2009).
 - [10] S. J. Akhtarshenas, J. Phys. A **38**, 6777 (2005).
 - [11] Y. C. Ou, H. Fan and S. M. Fei, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 012311 (2008).
 - [12] J. S. Kim and B. C. Sanders, J. Phys. A **41**, 495301 (2008).
 - [13] W. Dür, G. Vidal and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000).
 - [14] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne and A. Zeilinger, *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe*, edited by M. Kafatos (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1989), p. 69.